'A'.[232] In fact, this even leads to an ironic situation in which the unreliability of 'H' is adduced as evidence for its reliability.[233] Still, 'SGZ' is the most balanced edition available, providing both a historical-philosophical introduction and many sharply-focused notes, especially in the form of textual cross-references.[234]

To summarize, in other words, one merely has to keep straight the following editions with their generally distinctive features:

	Date:	*Edition:*	*Distinctive Features:*
1	1908	'AT'	Prefers 'A' over 'H' and ignores 'N'.
2	1965/1966	'C'	Balances 'A' with 'H' and presents 'N'.
3	1973	'SGZ'	Considers 'A' and 'N' and prefers 'H'.

As far as the Latin text of the present edition is concerned, once again, no systematic attempt has been made to determine 'in principle' which edition 'in general' is better. Rather, the procedure has been to try to decide – in particular – what works better when, where, and why. But obvious misspellings,[235] simple transpositions,[236] and orthographic peculiarities[237] have not usually been recorded. If there has been a principle for the selection of textual variants, then the principle has been that, since this is to be a *philosophical* edition of the *Regulæ*, no variant that would make a specifically philosophical difference in understanding should be neglected.

To this end, there are a number of philosophically helpful editions and translations of the *Regulæ*, namely (also in chronological order):

1 *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, translated by G. R. T. Ross, in: *The Philosophical Works of Descartes*, translated by Elizabeth S. Haldane and G. R. T. Ross (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911 ff.), vol. I, pp. 1–77. This edition offers a short preface, a few footnotes, and a translation that is still of more than merely historical interest.
2 *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii: Texte de l'édition Adam et Tannery avec une notice*, edited by Henri Gouhier (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1930/1946/1959). This edition, which would become Vrin's companion to Sirven's (see below), presents an improved version of the Latin text of 'AT' only, with a valuable introduction.
3 *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii / Règles pour la direction de l'esprit*, edited and translated by Georges Le Roy (Paris: Boivin, 1933). This is a bilingual Latin-French edition based on 'H' and 'A'.

[232] See Springmeyer's 'maxim' on p. XVI: '... so wird man sich bei der Herstellung des Textes, welcher dem ursprünglichen Wortlaut bei Descartes in dessen letzter Fassung möglichst nahekommen soll, zur Maxime machen können, H überall dort den Vorzug vor NA zu geben, wo sachlich nichts dagegen eingewandt werden kann.'
[233] Cf. Springmeyer, *Regulæ / Regeln*, p. XI ff., and Crapulli, *Regulæ: Texte critique*, p. XXV ff.
[234] Cf. also Heinrich Springmeyer, 'Eine neue kritische Textausgabe der *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii* von René Descartes', *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung*, vol. 24 (1970), pp. 101–125.
[235] E.g., 'SGZ', which is founded on 'C', which is grounded in 'AT', which is based on 'A' and on 'H', still contains an irritatingly regular lapsus in the form of an 'ingenim' (p. 54, l. 117, w. 2).
[236] E.g., in R. 10, § 2 (AT, X, p. 404, l. 10, ws. 3–4), 'C' reads 'ordo magis', whereas 'A' and 'AT' read 'magis ordo'.
[237] E.g., 'SGZ' prefers 'eandem', 'quandam', 'littera', etc., whereas 'C' prefers 'eamdem', 'quamdam', 'litera', etc. In matters morphological the Latin text of the present edition follows the aforementioned Georges' *Ausführliches Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch* as well as Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879/1956).

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

4 *Règles pour la direction de l'esprit*, translated by Georges Le Roy, in: *Descartes: Œuvres et Lettres* (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade), edited by André Bridoux, pp. 37–119 (Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1937/1953). This is a French translation with hardly any contextualization and no notes.

5 *Règles pour la direction de l'esprit*, translated by J. Sirven (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1945/1950/1959). This edition, Vrin's companion to Gouhier's (see above), is an accurate French translation only, with notes by a leading expert on Descartes' intellectual development up until just about that time at which he broke off the work on the *Regulæ*.

6 *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, in: The Library of Liberal Arts, vol. 129, edited and translated by Laurence J. Lafleur (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961). This edition contains a reliable English translation with modest contextualization by way of an introduction and some notes.

7 *Règles pour la direction de l'esprit*, translated by Jacques Brunschwig, in: *Descartes: Œuvres philosophiques*, edited by Ferdinand Alquié, vol. I: *1618–1637*, pp. 77–204 (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 1963/1988). This edition offers a French translation based on 'AT' as well as a contextualization thereof by means of many very well-placed notes.

8 *Règles utiles et claires pour la direction de l'esprit en la recherche de la vérité: Traduction selon le lexique cartésien, et annotation conceptuelle, avec des notes mathématiques de Pierre Costabel*, in: Archives internationales d'histoire des idées / International Archives of the History of Ideas, vol. 88, edited and translated by Jean-Luc Marion (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977). This edition has only one major flaw, to wit, it lacks a version of the Latin original. Otherwise, it is by far the most philosophical edition of the *Regulæ* presently available, containing in-depth and wide-ranging 'annotations' (pp. 85–291) on all aspects of the text.

9 *Rules for the Direction of the Mind*, translated by Dugald Murdoch, in: *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*, translated by John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, Dugald Murdoch, and (for vol. III only) Anthony Kenny (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984 [vol. II], 1985 [vol. I], and 1991 [vol. III]), vol. I, pp. 7–76. This edition presents a fine translation with a short preface as well as with some brief notes. The present edition has profitted a great deal from this useful predecessor.

Finally, an important supplementary text to the *Regulæ* is: Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole, *La logique ou l'art de penser, contenant, outre les règles communes, plusieurs observations nouvelles, propres à former le jugement, Édition critique par Pierre Clair et François Girbal* (Paris, 1981). For the authors of '*La logique de Port-Royal*' indicate that, when preparing the second edition of their work (1664),[238] they employed 'a manuscript of … Descartes … provided by Clerselier'.[239] It is surely the *Regulæ*, since in chapter 2 of part 4 of the *Logic or the Art of Thinking* they provide, for instance, a loose paraphrase of the latter part of Rule XIII. This paraphrase also contains a passage at a place corresponding to a lacuna in the middle of the same rule. Thus it might be a paraphrase of some of what is missing. For the present edition the relevant passage has been reproduced, with modernized orthography, as the Appendix.[240]

So much for the editorial history of the *Regulæ*, that is, at least for the limited purposes of the present edition.

[238] The first edition had appeared in 1662 – containing nothing from Descartes' *Regulæ*.

[239] Shortly before the material reproduced in the Appendix of the present edition one finds the following footnote: 'La plus grande partie de tout ce que l'on dit ici des questions, a été tiré d'un manuscrit de feu Monsieur Descartes, que Monsieur Clerselier a eu la bonté de prêter.' (Cf. *La logique ou l'art de penser*, p. 300.) In other words, 'most' of what is going to be said here about (the) 'questions' is taken from 'a manuscript of Descartes provided by Clerselier'.

[240] See *La logique ou l'art de penser*, pp. 300–301.

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

Bibliography: Observations, Opinions, Orientations

Since the bibliography of the present edition is primarily and ultimately a bibliography of items 'on' Descartes, it contains a lacuna due to the fact that it does not generally include literature from his own time. Thus one might also want to bear in mind the following short list of crucial literature generated by Descartes' 'contemporaries' (in alphabetical order):

1 Francis Bacon de Verulam (1561–1626), *Instauratio magna*, pt. II: *Novum organum sive indicia vera de interpretatione naturae* (London, 1620). The *New Instrument* of the *Great Renewal* contains profound reflections on 'a new methodology' almost contemporaneous with those of Descartes' *Regulæ*. The former focuses on physics; the latter concentrates on mathematics. Together they provide much of the theoretical basis for the mathematization of physics that so dominates modern natural science.

2 Isaac Beeckman (1588–1637), *Journal tenu par … de 1604 à 1634* (4 vols.), ed. C. de Waard (The Hague, 1939–1953). These scientific diaries contain the intellectual legacy of a 'Renaissance person' from whom Descartes learned some mathematics and some mechanics. They first met toward the end of 1618,[241] that is, just before the work on the *Regulæ* was begun, and they were in touch once again toward the end of 1628,[242] that is, just before it was suspended.

3 Pierre Charron (1541–1603), *De la sagesse* (Bordeaux, 1601/1604; Leiden, 1646). The attempt in *On Wisdom* to harmonize the Church's dogmatic absolutism and Montaigne's skeptical relativism yields a cogent but epigonic statement of the retrofragability of human rationality.

4 Galileo Galilei (1564–1642), *Dialogo sopra i due massimi sistemi del mondo, tolemaico e copernicano* (Florence, 1632). The *Dialogue on the Two Chief World Systems* was the occasion for the second 'condemnation' of Galileo by the Inquisition in 1633 (the first 'warning' had been in 1616), which also plunged Descartes into despair about the prospects of the Copernican revolution as well as of his own *Treatise on the World*.

5 Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1556), *Exercitia spiritualia* (Rome, 1548). The *Spiritual Exercises* are the book to read for insight into the intellectual, moral, and religious worldview of Descartes' college teachers.

6 Marin Mersenne (1588–1648), *La vérité des sciences: Contre les sceptiques ou Pyrrhoniens* (Paris, 1625). *The Truth of the Sciences: Against the Skeptics or Pyrrhonists* was aimed at the skeptical revival, for example, by Montaigne, by Charron, and by Sanchez,[243] although Descartes may not have become *especially* interested in skepticism until the 1630's.

7 Idem, *Correspondance du P. … , religieux minime* (17 vols.), ed. C. de Waard et al. (Paris, 1932–1988). This represents an encyclopedia of scientific development during the second quarter of the seventeenth century, the compiler being Descartes' very own philosophical agent.

8 Michel de Montaigne (1533–1592), *Essais* (Bordeaux, 1580/1582 [bks. I–II] and 1588 [incl. bk. III]; Paris, 1595 [posthumous ed.]). The *Essays* are by far the single most important work to study in order to comprehend what alternative there was to Descartes' brand of rationalism. For, whereas Descartes asserts that 'reason' is essentially homogeneous in all human beings, Montaigne claims that it is irreducibly heterogeneous – with inevitable implications for the role of rules of method.[244] In fact, understanding Descartes presupposes appreciating Montaigne. Of course, Montaigne's skepticism cannot possibly be Pyrrhonism without further ado.

[241] Cf. AT, X, 15 ff.

[242] Cf. ibid., p. 329 ff.

[243] See Francisco Sanchez (1552–1623), *Quod nihil scitur* (*That Nothing Is Known*) (Lyons, 1581).

[244] The two key texts in this regard are Descartes' *Discourse on the Method*, according to which rationality is essentially the same for all (cf., e.g., pt. I, § 1 ff.), and Montaigne's *An Apology for Raymond Sebond*, according to which 'reason' is a phenomenal and malleable construct and instrument that inevitably varies from one individual to another: 'J'appelle toujours "raison" cette apparence de discours que chacun forge en soi; cette raison, de la condition de laquelle il y en peut avoir cent contraires autour d'un même sujet, c'est un instrument de plomb et de cire, allongeable, ployable et accommodable à tout biais et à toutes mesures; il ne reste que la suffisance de le savoir contourner.'

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

9 Adrianus Romanus (1561–1615), *In Archimedis circuli dimensionem expositio et analysis: Apologia pro Archimede* … (Würzburg, 1597) and *Universae mathesis idea, qua mathematicae universim sumptae natura, praestantia, usus et distributio brevissime proponuntur* (Würzburg, 1602). Here the Belgian mathematician develops the idea of a *mathesis universalis* in detail and is arguably the key source for Descartes' idea of the same. This is recommended reading especially for those who might be tempted to conflate *mathesis* and *methodus*.

10 François Viète (1540–1603), *In artem analyticem Isagoge, seorsim excussa ab opere restitutae mathematicae Analyseos, seu, Algebra nova* (Tours, 1591; Paris, 1624/1631; Leiden, 1635/1646). Vieta's modern idea of *numerus* as the number intending a concept of quantity – versus the ancient idea of *arithmos* as the number intending a plethora of things – made possible the *New Algebra*.[245] But Descartes learned more from the competent Jesuit Christoph Clavius (1537–1612), 'the Euclid of his time'.

The key philosophical monographs 'on' the *Regulæ* are (this time in chronological order):

1 Leslie John Beck, *The Method of Descartes: A Study of the 'Regulæ'* (Oxford, 1952; New York, 1987). This fine book, minimizing the historical context and maximizing the philosophical text, remains the most systematic and thorough treatment of the *Regulæ* in English.

2 Harold H. Joachim, *Descartes's Rules for the Direction of the Mind: Reconstructed from Notes taken by his Pupils*, ed. E. E. Harris (London/New York, 1957; Westport, CT, 1979). This is a useful set of introductory lectures prepared around 1930 and now extant only in a version which did not enjoy the benefit of a final revision by the author.

3 Jean-Paul Weber, *La constitution du texte des 'Regulæ'* (Paris, 1964). This book is perhaps the finest example of heroic hermeneutics in all of Cartesian scholarship. Presenting a veritable 'stratigraphie' of the work, it is an uncompromising attempt to grasp the text as its own context.

4 Giovanni Crapulli, *'Mathesis universalis': Genesi di un'idea nel XVI secolo* (Rome, 1969). This is the best treatment of the historical and philosophical background of the idea of a 'mathesis universalis' in the century before Descartes, although those who are looking for anything *on his* concept of a 'mathesis universalis' here are going to be disappointed.

5 Lüder Gäbe, *Descartes' Selbstkritik: Untersuchungen zur Philosophie des jungen Descartes* (Hamburg, 1972). This is a careful analysis of when, how, and why – to put it simply – 'Descartes became a Cartesian', emphasizing his later criticism of his earlier thought. Timing alone renders an interpretation of the *Regulæ* crucial to the thesis.[246]

6 Jean-Luc Marion, *Sur l'ontologie grise de Descartes: Science cartésienne et savoir aristotélicien dans les 'Regulæ'* (Paris, 1975/1979/1981). This study is a conceptual reconstruction of the text of the *Regulæ*, emphasizing content over structure – contra Weber – and transcending the view of Descartes as a straightforward anti-Aristotelian.

Cf. Screech's translation, op. cit., pp. 636–637: 'By *reason* I always mean that appearance of rationality which each of us constructs for himself – the kind of reason which can characteristically have a thousand contrary reactions to the same subject and is like a tool of malleable lead or wax: it can be stretched, bent or adapted to any size or to any bias; if you are clever, you can learn to mould it.' Thus Montaigne's 'deconstructionist' conception of human rationality is a remarkably *premodern* 'postmodern' phenomenon.

[245] What Descartes may have known about Vieta's work and when he might have known it, is not uncontroversial – cf., e.g., AT, XII, 212 ff.

[246] See, e.g., the first lines of p. 1: 'Frühestens im Winter 1628/9 wird Descartes zu einem Cartesianer. Die wissenschaftliche Methodenlehre, die er zwischen 1619 und 1628 entwickelt hatte und deren schriftliche Fixierung in dem Fragment der *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii* er um 1628 einer letzten Redaktion unterzog, beruht auf Prinzipien, die mit der Philosophie Descartes' nach 1629 im Widerspruch stehen. Descartes ist auf dem Wege einer Selbstkritik zu einem Cartesianer geworden.'

Материал, защищенный авторским правом

Basic for the intellectual biography of Descartes and (or) for the historical background of the *Regulæ* are (again in chronological order):

1 Adrien Baillet, *La vie de Monsieur Des-Cartes* (2 vols.) (Paris, 1691/1961; Geneva, 1970; Hildesheim/New York, 1972). This almost contemporary life of Descartes, which is not specifically philosophical, is still the basic biography and the best place to start. The very accessible abridgement of it is: *Vie de Monsieur Descartes* (Paris, 1692/1946/1950).
2 Joseph Millet, *Descartes – Sa vie, ses travaux, ses découvertes avant 1637* (Paris, 1867). This pioneering work was the first scholarly attempt to offer an interpretation of the perplexing early fragments[247] and to try to propose a documentation of the philosopher's formative years.
3 Elizabeth S. Haldane, *Descartes: His Life and Times* (London/New York, 1905). To be sure, this biography predates both the Adam and Tannery edition of the works of Descartes and Adam's own life of the philosopher. None the less, it is still well worth reading.
4 Charles Adam, *Vie et oeuvres de Descartes: Étude historique, Supplément à l'édition de Descartes* (Paris, 1910). This ponderous study – volume XII of the *Œuvres de Descartes* – is the first modern critical biography of the philosopher, with chapters on every phase of his life, including a pair on 'La jeunesse de Descartes', one on the period from 1612 to 1619 and another on that from 1620 to 1628. But neither is of much use for the interpretation of the *Regulæ*. Adam's revised summary of his biography is: *Descartes, sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris, 1937).
5 Gustave Cohen, *Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVIIe siècle* (Paris/The Hague, 1921). By discovering the cultural, intellectual, and social milieu of *les français gentilshommes* in Holland before and during Descartes' time, this account renders plausible, for the first time, why the philosopher might have wanted to go there.
6 J. Sirven, *Les années d'apprentissage de Descartes (1596–1628)* (Albi, 1928; Paris, 1930; New York, 1987). This study, the classic account of Descartes' years at the Collège de La Flèche as well as of his earliest writings, argues – in a remarkable reversal – that the four rules of the *Discourse on the Method* (1637) date back to opuscules of 1619–1620, thus apprehending the rules of 'the *Regulæ* of 1628' as a later development (at least, that is, from the limited perspective of someone writing at this time).
7 Henri Gouhier, *Les premières pensées de Descartes: Contribution à l'histoire de l'anti-renaissance* (Paris, 1958/1979). This study, which also provides a critical overview of the previous accounts of Descartes' 'years of apprenticeship' from Baillet to Sirven, finds 'the young Descartes', by way of his 'first thoughts', 'reacting violently against the spirit of "the Renaissance" '[248] – which the reader may question.
8 Alexandre Tillmann, *L'itinéraire du jeune Descartes* (Lille/Paris, 1976). Not only is this meticulous study the latest and perhaps best account of the early Descartes, but it also has a lot to contribute to the perennial debates surrounding the *Entstehungsgeschichte* of the *Regulæ*.
9 Stephen Gaukroger, *Descartes: An Intellectual Biography* (Oxford, 1995). This excellent book, the only one of its kind in English, explains, in detail, not only what Descartes thought and when he thought it, but also why. It is a *philosophical* biography, but – understandably – it could not be entitled thus. The *Regulæ* are treated in chapters 4 and 5.

On the Cartesian method beyond the *Regulæ* one may consult:

1 Étienne Gilson (ed.), *René Descartes: Discours de la méthode: Texte et commentaire* (Paris, 1925/1926/1962/1966/1976/1987). This line-by-line – and sometimes word-by-word – commentary on the *Discourse* is still one of the best treatments of Descartes' method. It closes with some detailed parallels between texts of the *Discourse* and texts of the *Regulæ*.
2 George Heffernan, *René Descartes: Discours de la méthode pour bien conduire sa raison et chercher la vérité dans les sciences / Discourse on the Method of Conducting One's Reason Well and of Seeking the Truth in the*

[247] Cf. *Opuscules de 1619–1621*, in: AT, X, 171–276.
[248] See p. 9: '… le jeune Descartes réagissant violemment contre l'esprit de "la Renaissance" au moment où il échappe au "Moyen âge" … .'

Материал, защищенный авторским правом